

Grijalva (García (IL))	McHenry (Banks) Meng (Jeffries)	Ryan (Kildee) Sewell (Cicilline)	Roibal-Allard Ruiz	Slotkin Smith (WA)	Trahan Trone
Higgins (NY) (Tonko)	Morelle (Tonko) Napolitano (Correa)	Sires (Pallone) Stanton (Levin (CA))	Ruppersberger Rush	Soto Spanberger	Underwood Vargas
Himes (Hayes) Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)	Neal (McGovern) Payne (Wasserman)	Stefanik (Miller-Meeks)	Ryan Sánchez Sarbanes	Speier Stansbury	Veasey Vela
Kim (NJ) (Underwood)	Schultz Perlmutter (Neguse)	Steube (Franklin, Scott C.)	Scanlon Schakowsky Schiff	Stanton Stevens	Velázquez Wasserman
Kirkpatrick (Levin (CA))	Peters (Rice (NY))	Strickland (Torres (NY))	Schneider Schrader	Suzoi Swallow	Schultz Waters
Larson (CT) (DeLauro)	Porter (Wexton) Reschenthaler (Meuser)	Wagner (Walorski) Wilson (FL) (Hayes)	Schrier Scott (VA) Scott, David Sewell	Takano Thompson (CA) Thompson (MS)	Welch Wexton
Latta (Walberg) Lawson (FL) (Evans)	Rice (SC) (Timmons)	Rush (Underwood)	Sherrill Sires	Titus Tlaib	Wild Williams (GA)
Levin (MI) (Raskin)				Tonko Torres (CA)	Wilson (FL) Yarmuth
McEachin (Wexton)				Torres (NY)	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEE of California). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. RODGERS of Washington. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 211, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

YEAS—218

Adams	DeSaulnier	Lee (CA)
Aguilar	Deutch	Lee (NV)
Allred	Dingell	Leger Fernandez
Auchincloss	Doggett	Levin (CA)
Axne	Doyle, Michael	Levin (MI)
Barragán	F.	Lieu
Bass	Escobar	Lofgren
Beatty	Eshoo	Lowenthal
Bera	Español	Luria
Beyer	Evans	Lynch
Bishop (GA)	Fletcher	Malinowski
Blumenauer	Foster	Maloney
Blunt Rochester	Frankel, Lois	Carolyn B.
Bonamici	Gallego	Maloney, Sean
Bourdeaux	Garamendi	Manning
Bowman	García (IL)	Matsui
Boyle, Brendan	García (TX)	McBath
F.	Golden	McCollum
Brown	Gomez	McEachin
Brownley	Gonzalez,	McGovern
Bush	Vicente	McNerney
Bustos	Gottheimer	Meeks
Butterfield	Green, Al (TX)	Meng
Carbajal	Grijalva	Mfume
Cárdenas	Harder (CA)	Moore (WI)
Carson	Hayes	Morelle
Carter (LA)	Higgins (NY)	Moulton
Cartwright	Himes	Mrvan
Case	Horsford	Murphy (FL)
Casten	Houlihan	Nadler
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Napolitano
Castro (TX)	Huffman	Neal
Chu	Jackson Lee	Neguse
Cicilline	Jacobs (CA)	Newman
Clark (MA)	Jayapal	Norcross
Clarke (NY)	Jeffries	O'Halleran
Cleaver	Johnson (GA)	Ocasio-Cortez
Clyburn	Johnson (TX)	Omar
Cohen	Jones	Pallone
Connolly	Kahele	Panetta
Cooper	Kaptur	Pappas
Correa	Keating	Pascarell
Costa	Kelly (IL)	Payne
Courtney	Khanna	Pelosi
Craig	Kildee	Perlmutter
Crist	Kilmer	Peters
Crow	Kim (NJ)	Phillips
Davids (KS)	Kind	Pingree
Davis, Danny K.	Kirkpatrick	Pocan
Dean	Krishnamoorthi	Porter
DeFazio	Kuster	Pressley
DeGette	Lamb	Price (NC)
DeLauro	Langevin	Quigley
DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Raskin
Delgado	Larson (CT)	Rice (NY)
Demings	Lawrence	Ross

Aderholt	Gohmert	Moolenaar
Allen	Gonzales, Tony	Mooney
Amodei	Gonzalez (OH)	Moore (AL)
Armstrong	Good (VA)	Moore (UT)
Arrington	Gooden (TX)	Mullin
Babin	Gosar	Murphy (NC)
Bacon	Granger	Nehls
Baird	Graves (LA)	Newhouse
Balderson	Graves (MO)	Norman
Banks	Green (TN)	Nunes
Barr	Greene (GA)	Obenolte
Bentz	Griffith	Owens
Bergman	Grothman	Palazzo
Bice (OK)	Guest	Palmer
Biggs	Guthrie	Pence
Bilirakis	Hagedorn	Perry
Bishop (NC)	Harris	Pfleger
Boebert	Harshbarger	Posey
Bost	Hartzler	Reed
Brady	Hern	Reschenthaler
Brooks	Herrell	Rice (SC)
Buchanan	Herrera Beutler	Rodgers (WA)
Buck	Hice (GA)	Rogers (AL)
Bucshon	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Budd	Hinon	Rose
Burchett	Hollingsworth	Rosendale
Burgess	Hudson	Rouzer
Calvert	Huizenga	Roy
Cammack	Issa	Rutherford
Carl	Jackson	Salazar
Carter (GA)	Jacobs (NY)	Scalise
Carter (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Schweikert
Cawthorn	Johnson (OH)	Scott, Austin
Chabot	Johnson (SD)	Sessions
Cline	Jordan	Simpson
Cloud	Joyce (OH)	Smith (MO)
Clyde	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NE)
Cole	Katko	Smith (NJ)
Comer	Keller	Smucker
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Spartz
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Staubert
Cuellar	Kim (CA)	Steel
Curtis	Kinzinger	Stefanik
Davidson	Kustoff	Steil
Davis, Rodney	LaHood	Steube
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Stewart
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Taylor
Donalds	Latta	Tenney
Duncan	LaTurner	Thompson (PA)
Dunn	Letlow	Tiffany
Elizy	Long	Timmons
Emmer	Loudermilk	Turner
Estes	Lucas	Upton
Fallon	Luetkemeyer	Valadao
Feenstra	Mace	Van Drew
Ferguson	Malliotakis	Van Dwyne
Fischbach	Mann	Wagner
Fitzgerald	Massie	Walberg
Fitzpatrick	Mast	Walorski
Fleischmann	McCarthy	Waltz
Fortenberry	McCaul	Weber (TX)
Fox	McClain	Webster (FL)
Franklin, C.	McClintock	Wenstrup
Scott	McHenry	Westerman
Fulcher	McKinley	Williams (TX)
Gaetz	Meijer	Wilson (SC)
Gallagher	Meuser	Wittman
Garbarino	Miller (IL)	Womack
García (CA)	Miller (WV)	Young
Gibbs	Miller-Meeks	Zeldin
Gimenez		

NOT VOTING—3

□ 1153

Mr. CHABOT changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LAWSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, the Member, who is my designated proxy, did not submit my vote as instructed on September 24, 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 295, passage of H.R. 3755, the Women's Health Protection Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, on Friday, September 24, 2021, I was attending a funeral in Wyoming and was absent for votes. Had I been present, I would have voted: yea on rollcall No. 294 and nay on rollcall No. 295.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 294 and “nay” on rollcall No. 295.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Babin (Nehls)	Grijalva (García (IL))	Perlmutter (Neguse)
Boyle, Brendan	Higgins (NY) (Tonko)	Peters (Rice (NY))
F. (Jeffries)	Himes (Hayes)	Porter (Wexton)
Carter (GA)	Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)	Reschenthaler (Meuser)
(Rodgers (WA))	Kim (NJ)	Rice (SC)
Carter (TX)	(Underwood)	(Timmons)
(Calvert)	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Craig	(Levin (CA))	(Underwood)
(McCollum)	Larson (CT)	Ryan (Kildee)
DeSaulnier	(DeLauro)	Sewell (Cicilline)
(Thompson)	Latta (Walberg)	Sires (Pallone)
(CA)	Levin (MI)	Stanton (Levin (CA))
DesJarlais	(Raskin)	Stefanik (Miller-Meeks)
(Fleischmann)	McEachin	Steube
Escobar (García (TX))	(Wexton)	(Franklin, Scott C.)
Frankel, Lois	McHenry (Banks)	Morelle (Tonko)
(Clark (MA))	Meng (Jeffries)	Napolitano
Fulcher (Johnson)	Morelle (Tonko)	Strickland
(OH)	Neal (McGovern)	(Torres (NY))
Gaetz (Greene (GA))	Payne	Wagner
Gallego (Gomez)	(Wasserman)	(Walorski)
Gimenez (Waltz)	Schultz	Wilson (FL)
Gonzalez (OH)		(Hayes)
(Timmons)		
Gosar (Boebert)		

□ 1200

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inquire of the majority leader the schedule for next week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield formally to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today.

Mr. Speaker, the Budget Committee has announced a markup for the Build

Back Better Act for tomorrow and Saturday. It is my intention to bring it to the floor next week.

This legislation will help move tens of millions of Americans closer to economic security while also making transformational investments in making childcare more affordable, helping Americans access healthcare, and addressing climate change with the seriousness that it deserves and demands.

On September 27, pursuant to the rule passed on August 24, the House will consider the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. This legislation passed the Senate on a bipartisan basis last month and would create millions of good jobs all across America by investing in critical infrastructure.

That bill and the Build Back Better America Act are the essence of the vision and program that has been proposed by President Biden, which, as I said, will grow millions of jobs and make the lives of Americans more secure and safer.

Mr. Speaker, if time allows, the House may also consider three bills from the Committee on Education and Labor:

H.R. 3110, the PUMP for Nursing Mothers Act, which amends the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide workplace protections for mothers to pump breast milk in the workplace.

H.R. 3992, the Protect Older Job Applicants Act, which allows applicants to bring a disparate claim under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 when they experience age discrimination while seeking a job.

In addition, H.R. 2119, the Family Violence Prevention and Services Improvement Act of 2021, which modifies, expands, and reauthorizes the fiscal year 2026 Family Violence and Prevention Services program, which funds emergency shelters and supports related assistance for victims of domestic violence.

Mr. Speaker, lastly, there may be additional legislative items as possible and as necessary.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

As it relates to the reconciliation bill that the Budget Committee will be taking up tomorrow, the initial estimates on that bill are that it would, roughly, add up to be about \$3.5 trillion in new taxes and spending.

There are now estimates that that number will mushroom to well over \$4.2, \$4.3 trillion or higher, but we still don't have a CBO score on the lion's share of that legislation. The word we are getting from CBO, it may be weeks or months that we would get that score.

Does the gentleman know what the timeline is for getting an actual estimate from CBO on what the cost of that legislation is and will be, come tomorrow, when the Budget Committee takes it up?

Mr. HOYER. The Budget Committee is going to take it up tomorrow. They don't need a CBO score for that. The

Budget Committee chairman is seeking a CBO score as soon as that can be attained, but I don't know that particular date that that will occur.

Clearly, this bill has been under consideration for a very long period of time, and the President proposed it a very long time ago, in the early part of this year. So it is something that the CBO has been considering, that the committee has been considering. Hopefully, the CBO can produce a score relatively quickly. But I don't, in answer to the gentleman's question, have a specific time or date.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Then last week, I think we had about a dozen committees in Congress that took up different parts of that bill. Unfortunately, it seems that the cost keeps going up.

Could we get an assurance that before the bill actually comes to the floor for a vote before this House, we would get a CBO score to know how many trillions of dollars in new taxes and in new spending would be included and voted on before the House?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is my expectation that we will be getting a score. I want to tell the gentleman it is also my understanding that the expenditures that will be proposed will be paid for.

Mr. SCALISE. And, obviously, paid for would include new taxes—

Mr. HOYER. New revenue.

Mr. SCALISE.—including things like that are in this bill. There is a tax on natural gas, which every family in America that uses natural gas to heat their homes in winter or cool their homes in summer would have to pay.

I know that President Biden had committed that nobody making under \$400,000 would pay any new amount in taxes. Clearly, that provision of the bill would violate President Biden's pledge.

I am not sure if the gentleman anticipates new taxes like that being removed from the bill so that the President's pledge would not be violated.

If you have any insight on that, I would be happy to yield.

Mr. HOYER. As I said, the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Finance have worked on revenues to pay for what we are going to buy so that we do not create additional debt. That is my view, that they continue to have that intention.

There are use taxes on a lot of things, and there are also corporate taxes in that bill. There are some additional revenue items in that bill as well. But I can't tell you exactly because they have not offered a manager's amendment, which I expect to have offered at the Committee on Rules. That does not come out of the Budget Committee, as the gentleman knows.

The Budget Committee is going to put together the 12 bills and send them to the Committee on Rules, and then the Committee on Rules will act on

them. I expect a manager's amendment, but I cannot predict for the gentleman what that manager's amendment will be at this point in time.

Mr. SCALISE. Does the gentleman know if there is a possibility that the bill before the Budget Committee tomorrow, because they did expedite that hearing—just yesterday, there wasn't supposed to be a Budget Committee on Saturday to take up the reconciliation bill, so, clearly, it has been sped up. Is that because there is a possibility that the reconciliation bill could be voted on before the House next week?

Mr. HOYER. It is possible.

Mr. SCALISE. Does the gentleman have any idea on when we would find that out?

Mr. HOYER. Well, we have to see what the Budget Committee does tomorrow.

Mr. SCALISE. Well, I will be watching, for sure.

Mr. HOYER. We all will.

Mr. SCALISE. We all will.

On Monday, the schedule shows that the infrastructure bill is supposed to be coming up before the House floor. Is that going to be for debate and consideration, or will there be an actual vote on Monday night on the infrastructure bill?

Mr. HOYER. We will have to see how the debate goes on Monday, see how long that takes.

Mr. SCALISE. Well, we will be very involved in that debate as well.

As it relates to the next few weeks, there has been some talk that possibly the week of October 4 or beyond may be taken back as district work schedules to come back here.

Does the gentleman have any insight into what the schedule holds from October 4 and beyond?

Mr. HOYER. I have advised Members that, obviously, we have a lot of work to do and that we have scheduled a number of workweeks, committee workweeks—which, by the way, I think have been very successful. We started those in June of last year, and I think they worked out very well, giving the committees an opportunity to meet uninterrupted by having to come to the floor.

With votes, as we know, we continue to have the challenge not only of COVID but the variant, an additional illness spike, so we are still having votes longer than we otherwise would have. So I think that those work periods have worked very well, and there are some scheduled for October.

But I have also advised Members that we have a lot of work to do, and if we need more legislative time, we will provide for that, and Members will get sufficient notice for that. But I did want to put them on notice that we may have to have more floor time than is currently provided for by the committee workweek schedule.

But as soon as we have a sense of when those days will be needed, we will let Members know.

Mr. SCALISE. Well, we know that next week we anticipate, as the end of

the fiscal year comes, that there would be the continuing resolution possibly coming out of the Senate.

I know when it came out of the House, it was very clear that the Senate was not going to entertain the debt ceiling as part of the continuing resolution. So, clearly, the Senate is going to have to resolve what happens with the debt ceiling, although we have been told extraordinary measures would continue through October. So that is not as looming of a deadline as the September 30 government funding deadline that the CR would be involved with.

I know, on our side, we were very disappointed to see when something had to be pulled out on Tuesday, whether it was going to be the Iron Dome funding or the debt ceiling. Knowing that the Senate was not going to process the debt ceiling as part of that instrument, it would have seemed, to keep that on track, to remove the debt ceiling and deal with that separately, as the Senate ultimately will have to, and then keep the CR with the Iron Dome funding moving forward on something that could be a bipartisan vote.

Obviously, that didn't happen Tuesday. I would expect we will see something very different happen in the Senate. They may send that back to us sometime next week.

Does the gentleman have a timeline for what we should expect on legislation dealing with the funding of government prior to the September 30 deadline?

Mr. HOYER. Well, obviously, the government funding authority ends on September 30 at midnight, the end of the fiscal year, and it would be our intention to deal with whatever bill the Senate sends back to us—if, in fact, they do not take our bill—as soon as it comes to us.

We believe that it is absolutely essential not to shut down government, which is costly, disrupts the lives of the American people and those who are expecting services, and is irresponsible.

Even more irresponsible is not increasing the debt limit. I have been saddened on a regular basis that our Republican colleagues are prepared to vote for debt limits when you have a Republican President and not when you have a Democratic President, as if somehow it is the President that creates the debt.

The President doesn't create the debt. The Congress creates the debt. This is not for debt that we may create in the future. It is for debt that we have already created, either by cutting taxes, therefore cutting revenues, or by spending money.

As you know, the debt limit was substantially increased under the Trump administration in a bipartisan way. But unlike this year, Democrats joined with Republicans to ensure that the full faith and credit of the United States of America was not put at risk. And the President of the United States signed that legislation, a Republican President.

So it is, I think, very sad that our Republican friends did not join every Democrat in saying we will not put at risk the full faith and credit of the United States for debts that have been incurred.

Now, I have been here for some time, and just in terms of the public debt going up, under Bush 1, it went up 55 percent; Clinton, 37 percent; Bush 2, 86 percent; Obama, 88 percent; Trump, 39 percent.

□ 1215

Now, obviously, those figures all are based on a lower base than their successor had, but it is interesting that under Ronald Reagan, the debt went up 189 percent, and he signed every one of those. And he also urged us not to put the credit at risk.

In addition, on September 8, 2017, the Republican-controlled House voted 316-90 to suspend the debt limit through December 8, 2017, under a deal endorsed by President Trump. The "yea" votes included Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY, Ways and Means Chairman KEVIN BRADY, and Conference Chair CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS.

Again, on September 8, the Republican-controlled Senate voted 80-17 to suspend the debt limit through December 8, 2017. The "yea" votes included Majority Leader MCCONNELL, Majority Whip CORNYN, Finance Chairman Hatch, and GOP Conference Chair JOHN THUNE all voting in favor of that.

In addition, on February 9, 2018, a year later, the Republican-controlled House voted 240-186 to suspend the debt limit through March 1, 2019. Voting "yea" were Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY, Majority Whip STEVE SCALISE, Ways and Means Chairman KEVIN BRADY, GOP Conference Chair CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS, all voting for the measure.

Leader MCCONNELL has stated that it would be irresponsible not to extend either the date or the amount of the debt limit. The business roundtable has said this: Failure to let the U.S. Federal debt limit to meet the U.S. obligations would produce an otherwise avoidable crisis and pose unacceptable risk to the Nation's economic growth, job creation, and financial markets. Goldman Sachs has essentially said the same thing, the American Bankers Association, and numerous other organizations that I can mention.

So I am sorry that earlier this week the Republicans voted unanimously against keeping the government open and making sure that we did not compromise the full faith and credit of the United States of America. But I will assure the gentleman, as soon as a bill is sent back from the Senate, that we will take that up. I hope it is a responsible bill.

I hope it does what Senator MCCONNELL, under President Donald Trump, said ought to be done. Perhaps now that we have a Democratic President, somehow the fiscal responsibility does not seem as important as it did when

Donald Trump was President, and I think that is unfortunate.

I, personally, by the way, think that the debt issue is a phony issue. There are only very, very few countries that have a debt limit. The debt limit is decided when we spend money or cut revenues, not in some other venue. And once we do that, the assumption ought to be, and I think has been, that we are going to pay our debts as a country.

And the only time we came close to not doing that was about a little less than 10 years ago, and for the first time since I have been a Member of Congress, which is over 40 years, the rating of the United States was reduced, minisculely, but nevertheless reduced. A shocking consequence of playing games with the debt limit.

So I would hope that my friend would urge his party to not treat this as either a political issue or partisan issue, and would treat it as the issue it is, an issue of the fiscal responsibility and full faith and credit to the United States of America.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the gentleman that if you go back, both Republican and Democrat Presidents, whether it was a Republican Congress or a Democrat Congress, you had budget agreements that involved both agreements on spending and on debt. Bipartisan agreements.

The gentlemen should also recognize that this year there has been no such effort to reach out to the Republican side to get agreements. The gentleman is well-aware that under President Biden, while he promised during the campaign that he would work with everybody, he would work with Republicans, work with Democrats, instead, it has been a go-it-alone strategy on spending and on debt.

Very much to our opposition, we were against the trillions of new spending. We weren't consulted about the debt.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I will yield, but I first need to point out, because the gentleman did mention, that when we cut taxes, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, that cutting taxes reduced revenue to the Treasury. Maybe under a liberal ideology that is the thought process of how economics would work, but that is not how economics worked, and that is not how reality worked.

When we cut taxes, we actually kick-started our economy. We brought millions of jobs back to America, and the Federal Treasury took in more money. Cutting taxes brought in more revenue to the Treasury. In fact, if you go look at States like New York that raised taxes to try to go after millionaires and billionaires and picking winners and losers and dividing people, as they raise tax rates, they see people moving out of their State, less revenue.

In America, when we saw higher and higher tax rates ultimately getting to a 35 percent corporate rate, highest in the industrialized world, what we also

saw was great companies moving out of America, out of America to be able to stay afloat, not to avoid paying taxes. They were still paying taxes. They were just moving to other countries where they could remain competitive because they could no longer remain competitive in America.

It was by the hundreds that we would see what are called inversions, great companies moving out of America. Now, on the left, every time they would move they would wring hands and call the company's name. We would call the companies, and say, Why are you leaving? They didn't want to leave. They wanted to stay afloat so that they didn't have to fire the thousands of America workers they had. They wanted to stay viable.

So when we cut taxes, do you know since the day the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act was signed into law, there has not been a single inversion in America. Not a single American company moved out of America. In fact, the opposite. We saw companies by the droves moving back in. We saw jobs by the millions coming back to America.

So, again, to give an economics lesson, when we cut taxes the Federal Treasury actually took in more money, not less, because people created more jobs in America. They brought jobs back to America.

Companies increased wages. In fact, the biggest wage earners—and you can go look at the Department of Labor statistics—the bigger wage earners were lowest-income workers. All that goes away if this bill coming before the Budget Committee tomorrow is to pass. I hope it doesn't. But if it does, every economics expert that looks at the success of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has also recognized that it will lead to millions more jobs leaving America if they raise those rates.

If you put a natural gas tax on families, estimates are over a 12 percent increase in household electricity rates on families which, by the way, would hit lower-income people the hardest. That is the reality of tax increases and tax decreases.

So that brings us to the debt ceiling. The reason we voted against it were many. One was that, for whatever reason, the majority party decided to gut the Iron Dome funding that was initially in the bill; a billion dollars to allow Israel to replenish the Iron Dome missiles that were used defending themselves against terrorist attacks from Gaza, fueled by terrorist organizations, and backed by proxies like Iran. That is one of the driving reasons that you saw all of those "no" votes.

But if you also look at where the debt came from, it came from very partisan policies. There are 14 different bills this year where the majority party waived the PAYGO rules. PAYGO was a policy that said, you pay as you go. You want to pass policy, you want to spend money, pay for it.

It is a pretty commonsense idea, except on 14 different pieces of legislation

this year, the Democrat majority waived PAYGO, racking up trillions in new debt. We didn't vote for this spending. If the majority party wants to go it alone and have a partisan spending spree that jacks up trillions of new spending and debt, then it is incumbent upon the majority party to go address the debt ceiling consequences that were created by this reckless spending.

Fourteen different times your party waived PAYGO. We didn't vote for that. But then you want us to pay for it? That is not how this works. If the majority party wants to work with us on a budget agreement, we are right here. We have never been asked to be a part of a budget agreement. We surely weren't consulted about the spending because we opposed those levels.

There were things we wanted to do, including on some of the relief packages where we felt, let's focus in on helping people who are struggling, not paying people not to work, not bailing out States that are flushed with multi-billion dollar surpluses, while sending that bill to our kids.

That is not responsible, but that is what the majority party did. And as they jacked up all that spending, they jacked up debt and bumped us against the debt limit. We are not going to be a part of that because we didn't agree with the spending. We weren't consulted on the spending.

If your party wants to spend money, your party ought to be responsible enough to deal with the consequences of it. We are more than happy to work with you on how to solve this spending and debt problem in a bipartisan way, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

It is hard to respond, Mr. Speaker, to a not-responsive issue on why we are not voting to extend the debt limit. MCCONNELL said he wasn't going to vote for the debt limit long before there was anything about Iron Dome. In fact, we passed Iron Dome. We passed it overwhelmingly with over 420 votes. It is now over in the Senate, and I hope they pass it immediately, which would, by the way, be faster than they would have done the CR.

Having said that, the gentleman voted for \$5 trillion of debt in 2020. It wasn't paid for. We were confronting a great crisis called COVID-19. And in a bipartisan way, we passed \$5.4 trillion of spending, the largest amount of spending, I think, in any year that I have been in this Congress.

We did it in a bipartisan way with the expectation that we would borrow that money to meet the emergency that confronted us, and that we would pay for that debt. It didn't have anything to do with politics. It didn't have anything to do with who was President of the United States. And all that verbiage was to mask the fact that, frankly, my Republican friends don't like voting to pay the bills.

They do like to cut revenues, whether or not they balance the budget. And

the good news, from their standpoint, was they inherited an economy that was going up incrementally every year.

The gentleman talks about jobs on his tax bill. Under President Obama, who inherited a tanking economy from George Bush, not withstanding the tax cuts that they had effected, during the Obama administration we created 10,838,000 jobs. During the Trump administration 6,688 net jobs. About 35 percent less. But that is irrelevant, it is a smokescreen. It is to distract.

The fact of the matter is we have incurred debt, we have incurred it in a bipartisan way. Whether the objective was defense or whether it was domestic or tax cuts, we created the debt on behalf of the United States of America. We borrowed money and we said to our creditors: we will pay you back.

It had nothing to do with Iron Dome. The Republicans had said if the debt limit was in there, they weren't going to vote for it. They were not going to take responsibility for the debt that they, in a bipartisan way, \$5.4 trillion last year, incurred, signed by Donald Trump.

Donald Trump could have stopped every nickel of that money from being spent. He did not. It was a bipartisan agreement.

□ 1230

I believe, although I don't have the figures in front of me, that Mr. SCALISE voted for every one of those bills. He can correct me if I am wrong on that.

But the debt limit is a pretense that somehow if you vote against raising the debt limit you will somehow, Mr. Speaker, solve the debt problem of the United States.

No. The way you solve that is paying your bills.

I would urge the gentleman—I don't know what is going to come back from the Senate, but I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, my experience has been, particularly over the last, about 15 years, it has been Democrats who have responded to the fiscal responsibility call of Republican Speakers—Mr. Boehner and Mr. Ryan—who couldn't get the majority of Republicans in their own party to vote for their bill exercising fiscal responsibility. I am proud to say that Democrats were there on behalf of bills sponsored, essentially—I don't know the name of the sponsor on the bill—but supported by both Speaker Boehner and Speaker Ryan. I don't have those figures in front of me, but I can bring them up perhaps next time we talk.

So I would urge my friend, let's get off this political Biden this or—I don't even know if any of those bills have passed because I don't know what list he is reading from, but, Mr. Speaker, he lists the names of bills in Congress.

We passed the rescue plan but got no Republicans on that.

Why?

Because we were over having a Republican President. So now a Democratic President was trying to make

sure that this country didn't fall through the floorboards, that our small businesses didn't fall through the floorboards, that our families and individuals didn't fall through the floorboards, and that our childcare providers didn't fall through the floorboards. So they were through voting for those bills. They were voting for them when Trump was President but stopped voting for them when Biden was President. I get that. But the debt limit is about all of us. It is about our country.

Very frankly, as Goldman Sachs and the Business Roundtable and others have said, it is about the global economy. It is about jobs. It is about working men and women having jobs and America being competitive with the rest of the world. That is what the debt limit is about, and that is what the Business Roundtable is saying, not one of our spokes-organs. That is what the Chamber of Commerce is saying.

So, yes, we can argue the specifics, the 4 million less jobs were created under Trump than were created under Obama. We can talk about that. We can talk about a larger debt under Trump in terms of actual dollars. I am not going to talk about that.

Why?

Because we incurred them together because we needed to do so because our country was in trouble and our people were in trouble.

So I will tell the gentleman we are going to—his question was, in case we all forgot it, we probably did—that we are going to deal with the bill that comes back because we are absolutely committed to making sure that the full faith and credit of the United States is not put at risk.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I do need to correct the RECORD because the gentleman implied that the relief packages from 2020 were part of the debt ceiling that is being raised in the current legislation that is moving forward. That is just not accurate.

I have seen talking points out there, but Mr. Speaker, if you look at the trillions that my friend and I supported that were good policy, that was included in the debt ceiling negotiation from last year. It was in there. It was part of the debt ceiling negotiation from last year. That was passed on a bipartisan basis.

What we are talking about for this year, including the \$1.9 trillion that was not a bipartisan package, is new debt. What is being anticipated in the \$4 trillion, \$5 trillion-dollar-package that the Budget Committee is taking up is going to be new debt that would be included in the debt ceiling negotiation that my friend would expect us to vote for.

We don't support that new spending and that new debt. We did support the spending and the debt from last year in the relief packages that we all supported—and we paid for it—in the debt ceiling negotiations from last year.

The gentleman might have different talking points, but that is a fact. It was legislation that was voted on in a bipartisan fashion.

Mr. HOYER. I have different facts.

Mr. SCALISE. It was voted on on a bipartisan basis and was passed by Congress. Where the debt ceiling is today is ultimately going to be negotiated in the Senate, but it won't be in the bill that was sent over to the Senate on Tuesday.

The Senators have made it clear. They don't have 60 votes for that bill. It is a 60-vote bill. They might have to take it up under a reconciliation package. That is for the Senate to decide. Maybe in the next few days the Senate will decide that and send it back, but that was not something that anybody expected the Senate to pass when it left the House on Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I will not characterize the substance of that argument. However, I believe it has no merit, Mr. Speaker, none, zero, zip.

It is as if we Democrats, when we voted three times to assure that we didn't violate the debt limit under Donald Trump, as if we would say: Well, this is not our debt, this was, after all, the debt of the tax cut of 2017, so we shouldn't pay this.

In fact, the debt, of course, like family debt, is not necessarily for the car, for the mortgage, or for the clothes that we bought for our children to go back to school. It is a cumulative debt, a cumulative debt that—by the way, under Democratic Presidents since President Truman—were increased 24 percent; under Republicans since Truman, 45 percent.

It would be ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, for me to say: Well, I am only going to pay for this debt, that debt, and this debt that I agree with.

Of course, the \$5.4 trillion that Mr. SCALISE and I voted for in 2020 is a part of the debt that we need to have to service now. In fact, what we of course did, we didn't increase the debt limit per se because politically that was very controversial because people demagogue it. So what we did was we changed the date, which is a ruse, which is a political sleight of hand. It has the same exact effect.

So, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, the argument that it is not my debt and your debt and this—in fact, most of those bills haven't passed and haven't created any debt yet. I don't know the list, so I don't know whether they have been passed or some have passed. I presume, obviously, the rescue plan did pass, it wasn't paid for. Of course, it was approximately 30 percent of what Mr. SCALISE and I voted for in 2020.

But, nevertheless, the debt is the debt; and not to support making sure that America legally can pay that debt is irresponsible.

Mr. SCALISE. Again, this will continue as we see whatever comes out of the Budget Committee that will be trillions. We know it is trillions. We just don't know how many, maybe 4, maybe 5 trillion in new debt that the date that was put in the legislative text—it wasn't an amount, it was a date that the majority party included—in December of 2022 that maybe that changes in the Senate, but it would include the trillions, not only that were included in the \$1.9 from earlier this year that was partisan, but also on this tax-and-spend bill that is moving through Budget tomorrow.

I would like to ask one final question about other potential legislation for next week. I know the gentleman and I have had conversations in the past about bills that maybe aren't currently scheduled that could be, some of them have been added to the schedule, not all.

We know there is a crisis at our southern border. There are a number of legislative instruments that have been filed to try to confront it. I haven't seen any of those come to the floor. They are surely not listed for next week, but there are a number I would at least like to bring to the gentleman's attention to see if they could—as we are watching the border get even more out of hand—potentially give tools to the President to address it in a way where he is not addressing it today.

We know there has been a bill by Ms. HERRELL, the number of that bill is H.R. 471, the PAUSE Act, which would allow for enforcement of Title 42 in a way more clear than the administration has expressed their abilities.

We also have H.R. 4828 by Mr. KATKO which gives even more additional tools to help secure the border.

I would hope the gentleman would look at those legislative instruments. As there are maybe more days we will be here than there are legislative instruments anticipated, these could be other bills that we could take up that would deal with very pertinent and serious problems that our country is facing that aren't being addressed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I don't know the status of those bills. I will check on the status of those bills.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, there is a tragedy occurring at our border. There are people in grievous circumstances and in unbearable danger in their home countries. That has been a case for some period of time, and we have some very bad people taking advantage of that and promising them a free route to America, taking advantage of that pain, that suffering, and that fear that so many people have, in this case Haitians who fled their own country, presumably many of them after an extraordinary earthquake and they are living in places that are not their homes.

We all talk about it, and we all believe that America is the greatest

country on the face of the Earth. It is. Therefore, it is not surprising that people who are in pain and grieving and are concerned for the future of their children want to come to the United States of America. But, clearly, we cannot take all of the people who would like to come to America.

Therefore, we need a system because America is made up of immigrants. It has been made strong by immigrants. It has been made successful by immigrants. It has been made a great country by immigrants.

My own father came from Denmark at the age of 32 in 1934. Almost everybody who serves in this House, some are immigrants themselves who came themselves to the country. Some at 2 years of age and some at other ages.

The gentleman is correct. We need to deal with this. We need to deal with it in a humanitarian way, in a way that honors our values and respect for individual lives and individual persons. That is one of the great, great differences that we celebrate in America, the importance that we put on the individual.

We said that we hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal—today we clearly would say all men and women—and endowed not by us, not by our Constitution, and not by our laws, but by God. We have some of God's children who are fearful, scared, and running, running to a safer place. And that place for almost all the world is America.

So we have a responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to adopt a rational, comprehensive immigration reform regime where people will know the rules of coming to America. They will know the rules of how you apply, how you are processed, and how you are vetted. Whether you are coming here because you just want to come to America to succeed and to make your family live in a better neighborhood called America, or you are coming because your family and your are unsafe in the country in which you then reside, we need comprehensive immigration reform.

I would be glad to work very closely with my friend, the Republican whip from Louisiana, on seeing if we can get to that place because we have all been talking about it, all of us.

I think there is not a person in this room—I don't know about in this room, but over the years—who hasn't said our immigration system is broken, who hasn't said we need secure borders, who hasn't said we need secure borders and revealed in the fact that we are a nation of immigrants who have made us stronger so that we can get to a place where we pursue a rational policy for implementing that concept.

So I will tell my friend, I will look at those two or three pieces of legislation he mentioned and talk to the committee chairs about their status and let the gentleman know.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that, and I look forward to having those conversations with the gen-

tleman from Maryland on that and all the other issues that will come before us next week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1245

ABORTION CARE IS HEALTHCARE

(Ms. UNDERWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, choosing whether to become a parent is one of the most important decisions a person will make in their lifetime. It is a decision we should be able to make for ourselves. But over the past decade, extremist anti-abortion politicians have passed more than 450 laws that undermine the freedom to make that decision.

Our laws should protect our rights, like the right to abortion, not control and dehumanize us. We aren't truly free unless we can control our own bodies, lives, and future.

As a nurse, I know that when people have access to a full range of healthcare services, including the full spectrum of reproductive health and maternity care, they are healthier and their families thrive.

Because abortion is healthcare.

The legislation that House Democrats passed today will protect access to healthcare and reproductive rights for all Americans. It ensures that, going forward, we all have the freedom to control our own bodies, safely care for our families, and live with dignity.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to take it up immediately and send it to President Biden's desk.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF LANCE CORPORAL KAREEM NIKOUI

(Mr. CALVERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a fallen marine from my congressional district. Our Nation relies upon young men and women voluntarily stepping forward to defend and protect the liberties we hold so dear. As a young man growing up in Norco, California, Lance Corporal Kareem Nikoui was inspired to answer that call.

When he joined the Marine Corps, Kareem was following in the footsteps of patriots. Like his fellow marines, he was not signing up for glory or reward but out of a sense of duty.

In his final days, Lance Corporal Kareem Nikoui was on the front lines of a mission to secure freedom for desperate people. Kareem and our other fallen heroes conducted themselves with bravery and compassion. In those dark days, they shined bright.

Our community in Riverside County, California, has stepped up to support

and embrace the Nikoui family as they grieve this unimaginable loss. We should honor Kareem by carrying the torch of service, duty, and sacrifice he so proudly advanced until his final breath.

May God comfort the Nikoui family, and may God bless America.

TEXAS WOMEN ARE UNITED STATES CITIZENS

(Mr. RASKIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, the women of Texas are citizens of the United States, but they are being treated like outlaws by their own legislature.

Under the Texas law, any person, including murderers, serial rapists, sexual harassers, January 6 insurrectionists, or Texas State legislators themselves, can sue doctors, nurses, mothers, fathers, medical personnel, simply for helping a woman in Texas exercise her constitutional rights under *Roe v. Wade* and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* for \$10,000.

You want to give \$10,000 to a total stranger for helping your daughter through a personal crisis caused by a rape? Move to Texas.

You want to join the GOP in turning America into a nation of theocratic busybodies and vigilante bounty hunters policing other people's families? Go right ahead.

But for me, I am standing with the Constitution of the United States. I am voting for the Women's Health Protection Act, and I am proud that we are passing it today.

UNPRECEDENTED GOVERNMENT SPENDING

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, the \$3.5 trillion spending plan by the Democrats is the most expensive single piece of legislation in the history of this country. If passed, the Democrats will have added \$13 trillion in new spending since they took control of the House in 2019.

When combined with annual government funding and the \$1.9 trillion Biden bailout bill, the \$3.5 trillion socialist tax and spending plan would increase yearly government spending by over 73 percent each year for the next 10 years. To pay for these expensive and ill-advised policies, we would see the largest tax increase in American history, with two-thirds of employer tax increases being borne by lower and middle-income Americans.

This unprecedented spending spree is fueling inflation right now and hurting low-income and middle-income families the most, the very populations these policies purport to be helping.

Inflation is a tax on the poor, running at 7 percent on an annualized